P 7. 72-98.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1897-98

192 .

L.R.

File No. 96-97

Serial Nos. 1-11

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1-11

In ~~Part~~ 3 for June 1897

Sale of Lands for arrears of Revenue in Srinivasa Varam Village, Vayar Taluk.

Countersigned 96

17-11-97

Please see Petn No 736
9.9.97.

AK
17/9/97.

Refer petn

KMR 18/11/97
Intimated

AK
18/11/97

The Khatedar of SNo 20 was one Mahabalaya thonpu 1/2 the Land was enjoyed by Nagappa (called hereafter as the Resp's report)
The notice of demand for arrears dated 19/6/96 amounting to Rs 28-7-7 was served on Mahabalaya & Nagappa on 7/7/96 (Serial No 1)
Mahabalaya disclaimed responsibility for the arrears & stated that the portion belonging to Nagappa might be sold (Serial no 1-4)
The amildar declared the holding forfeited on 17/7/96 (Serial No 2)
The sale notice dated 17/7/96 was served on Mahabalaya & Nagappa & other persons on 23/7/96; one was absent & the defaulter's dwelling place was affixed & the sale took place on 28/8/96
The entire sale-amount was credited to the Government on 29/8/96 (Serial No 20)
The sale notice was affixed to the Resp's office as required by law (Serial No 19)
On 3/9/96 Respondent-manager petitioned the amildar requesting him to cancel the sale (Serial No 10)
The amildar took down depositions

Gl. No. 34571
169 5 NOV 97

From The Deputy Commissioner Shimoga

To The Secretary to the Board of Revenue Govt. and Ex-officio Secretary to Govt.

Dated 12th
Despatched
Received
General No. 586
No. 417

Enclosure No. 3 with records

With reference to the memorandum No 417 dated 17th September 1897 submitting report on the petition from Nanappa alias Subbaraya, Headman Tavanur village, Nagar Taluk.

Petition filed
17/11

No. 586/477

Enc: 3 with Enums

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Shimoga District
12th November 1897

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Genl and Rev: Depttt

Sir,

With reference to
Government Official memo-
randum No. 4117 dated the
17th September 1897, for-
warding for report a
petition from Ronappa
alias Subbaraya Krishnappa
Purume-village, Sagar
Taluk, appealing against
the order of the Deputy
Commissioner, Shimoga
District, reversing the

Shimoga Dy Com^r's no 586/477
δ 12/11/97

from the appellant & respondent
& also a mahazar from
the villagers regarding the
validity of the sale held on 26/
These together with a state-ment
showing the conduct of sale
from beginning to the
end (a very valuable paper
dated no 20) were submitted
to the Asst Dy Com^r office on 3/10/96
The Asst Dy Com^r directed the
amin to take down appellant's
statement. This statement
was to the effect that
Nagappa had discharged
the debt due to respondent
mortgage.
The Asst Dy Com^r confirmed
the sale for the following
reasons
(1) The respondent mortgagor
presented his petition for
the cancellation of sale to the
Asst Dy Com^r office on 5/2/97 i.e. after
within 30 days after the sale & hence
the sale could not be cancelled
under Sec^n 164 on the grounds
mentioned therein

(2) That the sale could not be cancelled under s 65 as the sale was properly conducted in other respects & moreover as the debtor was said to have been discharged & mangrath did not get his name registered in the accounts. This was passed on 7/2/97 The dy Comr cancelled the sale on 5/5/97 as he was of opinion that mangrath was misled & Nagappa was put to substantial loss.

(50 no 91 23-30 84/4/91 R 3535)

So no 4377-84 8/4/92 R 634

Note to Rule XXXII

= The appellant's proceedings from the receipt of respondent's petn dd 3/5/96 to his objections & the depositions seem to be ultra vires. The Code does not contemplate any application to the appellate for cancellation of sale. At this stage the records could not reach - and in this case they did not reach - the Board within 30 days from the date of sale.

= All the formalities relating to the sale seem to have been properly conducted with the exception

Para 1 of Rule XXXV
requires that 15 days
shall elapse from the
date of service of demand
notice before the forfeiture
is declared. In this case
there was only an
interval of 10 days.
This irregularity could
not have prejudiced
the Appellant or the Khoja
and S/Committee

4/1/98

R2 7.00
4/1/98

Parliament in
the usual course
requires
the forfeiture was
declared prematurely
MHS

Drafted
4/4/98
(1) Dollah Bin 5/1/98 15 days
(2) Draw up for perusal
5/1/98

LR 96-97-1

1897

(1)

No. 698 A.J. No. 23 97-98

Name of Petitioner Konappa alias Subraya

Village (Tarumé) Brahmin Tarumé

Taluk Kasaragod

District South Canara

Date of Arzi 3-8-'97

Date of Receipt 16-8-'97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2

ABSTRACT.

This is an appeal against the order of the Asst Commr No. 1871, dt 5-5-'97 cancelling the sale of the Survey No. 20 (Brahmin Tarumé) for non-payment of Govt revenue confirmed by the Collector of South Canara in the name of the Petr.

States that one Nagappa, a Kisseedar of the Khata of Mahalinga, failed to pay his arrears of revenue (Rs 25-2) during the year 1895-96; that consequently 32½ cents of garden land having an assessment of Rs 13/- and forming a portion of the S.No. 20 was put up to auction and

Complied with Rev. Rec. 4311-94
R634-92

dt. 4-9-92.

1) Asst. Collr. offered Stamp-stuff.

(2) Petr. complied by letter dt 5-5-97. Case laid before Collr (Taking into consideration the time taken in the preparation) 28/8/97

(3) Appeal against Dy Comr's order reversing the Asst Collr's order confirming a sale for recovery of arrears of revenue. Petr is the purchaser - the sale stands that he has improved the land

(4) Council Case

Petr contends that the facts as found by the Dy Comr and Asst Collr

Asst & 2nd Comr 28/8/97

Rd 7 copies 28.8.97

Case forwarded with the records of the case

4/9/97

Fwd

pay 6/9/97

Rs 105= - - - ; that the sale
was confirmed by the Sub. Div. Officer
of Sagar; that the aggrieved party,
- Nagappa and other takavandars,
thereupon appealed to the Govt. who
cancelled the said sale with the following
words: -

"The petrs (ie the takavandars Nagappa &c)
appeals before the sale ~~was closed~~ date
and offers to pay up all arrears due
on the land put up to auction as well as
on the whole of Nagappa. On being
informed what the arrears due was,
they paid the same and went away.
It seems that it was afterwards
found out that a little more was still
due and that to recover this little balance
the land was sold. The sale is improper
as the parties were neither informed of the
small due that was afterwards found
out as existing against them, nor was
the full amount recovered from them at
once. The sale is cancelled (Order No 1871 & 5577)."

The petr further states that the
above order ~~was~~ is not based on any
facts mentioned in the record, -

that the omission on the part of the
Sale-conductor, mentioned in the above
Govt's order was the mistake of the
Taluk authorities and none of his, and that
to cancel the sale on this ground is against
all rule;

that on account of the said cancellation
of sale the Govt has to owe him Rs 25= - -
towards the interest on his purchase-amount
and Rs 50 - - towards the amount which
he has since laid out on the land, -

that the takavandars failed to give
the full amount at once with a purpose,
and, when that purpose was defeated
by the petrs buying the land at a higher

Contd
17

they carried the complaint
to the D/Comm^r out of envy

that the Sagan Sub Div^n
Officer's decision is right
because it was passed after
the perusal of all the records
while D/Comm^r's order is wrong
as he did not see any records;

that the defaulter's land
had been hypothecated to the
takavidan from which he
had been having Kandayam
for the last 10 years,
and that as he has not spe-
cially registered it the deed
is not to be relied upon; —

+ that the Kandayam
for 96-97 has been received
from the pet^r already.

Prays that after the
perusal of the records, the
sale may be confirmed
in the name of the pet^r.

J.C. 24/8/97 (Rec^d for abs^e
on 23/8/97)

Received from D.H.C.O.
16/8/21

Jawahar Shankaraiah

Pet 417

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT. A. No. 23 97-98

L 96-97-2

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 498 dated 31-8-97 received at the Dewan's Office from Konappa alias Subrayan of Brahmana Hanure village, Magadi Tal. appealing against the order of the Dy. Comr. Shimoga reversing the order of the Sub Dy Officer confirming sale of a portion of S. No. 20 for arrears of Revenue

is forwarded, together with its 2 enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of ~~the~~ Shimoga District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosures is should be returned.

By order,

for ~~Chief~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE,

11/9/1897

7/9/97

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

1897. 3457

Pet. 242.

From,

The Deputy Comr.

Shimoga District

LR 96-97-3

To,

The Secretary to the

Govt of Mysore,

Genl. and Rev. Depts.

Dated 12th } November.
Despatched. }
Received. }

General No - 586.

No 477.

Enclosure no. 3 with
petn.

With reference to Office
Memorandum No. 417 dated
7th September 1897, I submit
report on the petition from
Honnappa alias Subraya,
Grihastha Jain of Village
Nagar Taluk.

No. 586
477.

LR 96-97-3

Encl 3. with papers.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Shimoga District.
12 ? November 1897.

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Penal and Revenue Dept.

Sir,

With reference to Government Official Memorandum No 417 dated the 17th September 1897, forwarding for report a petition from Ramappa alias Subraya, Brahmana Patel Village, Nagar Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District

Reviewing the Order

order of the Sub Division
Officer confirming the sale
of a portion of Survey
No. 20 for arrears of Land
Revenue, I have the
honour to state as follows:-
2. The records connected
with the case show that
the petitioner Ramappa
alias Subbiraya Upadhaya
had purchased the portion
of Survey No. 20 in question
in the enjoyment of Khisedar
Nagappa for Rs. 351. in
a Revenue Sale held on
the 23rd August, 1896, for
the balance of the arrears
of Revenue due for 1895-96
3. On the 23rd September
1896, one Channaiah Upadhya

of Aagaa, presented a petition to the Sheriff of Aagaa Fadute, stating that he had been praying the Kandayen since the land was mortgaged to him by the Dissedar Aagaafya, and that he likewise paid towards the Kandayen for the Cyear 1845-46 only Rs. 44-9-3, & Aagaafya was wrongly misled him to believe that no more was due, whilst, the former in collusion with the purchaser got the land sold for the balance of the arrears. The petitioner therefore, applied that the sale might be set aside.

4. The Assistant after making necessary enquiries in the case, submitted the entire records for the orders of the Sub Division Officer with his report No. 12 dated 14th January 1997 and stated that he suspected that the petitioner had been duped in signing

5. The Sub Division Officer of Pegar confirmed the sale of the land on the grounds that no irregularities either in publishing or conducting the sale were proved, and that Manjiah Kadapa, the mortgagee who in breached the validity of the sale, should have

presented his petition
within 30 days from the
date of sale as prescribed
under section 54 of the
Land Revenue Code.

6. On this Gangaiah Reddy,
appeared before the then Deputy
Commissioner Sri. B. N.
Venkatanarasaiah Iyengar
on the 15th March 1977 who,
after giving through the
records, perused the
order of the Sub Division
Officer and set aside the
sale for reasons stated
in the petition, ~~remark~~ that
had it not been for the
writ petition made by
Gangaiah Reddy, he
would have paid the

whole arrears due on the land, for the year 1895-96 and that therefore the sale could not be considered to have been held legally.

7. The Kanungo's records together with the appeal petition and its enclosures are herewith submitted for perusal and kind return when no longer required.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed't servt

F. Martin Leslie
Senior Supt. Commr
in Distinct charge
for Deputy Commr.

139 S

(4)

From

The Secretary to Govt
Land and Rev Depts

To

The Dy Commr Shimoga

LR 96-97-4

Dated 15th Jany 98

Despatched

Received

General No. 6339. P

P. No. 860

Enclosure No.

The Dy Comrs letter No. 586/477 dated 12-11-97, ~~forwarding~~ reporting on the petition of Kanappa alias Subraya, of Brahmana Tumri village in the Nagar Taluk, regarding the sale of a portion of S No 20 for arrears of Revenue.

In returning the records received with the above, with the petn and its enclosures, for reference and report, has the honor to observe that though the demand notice was served on Makalalayya and Nagappa

ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರರಿಗೆ
15-1-98

Nagappa on 7.7.96, the for-
feiture of the holding was
declared on 17.7.96 without an
interval of only 10 days,
though para (11) of Rule XXXV
of the Land Rev. Code requires
an interval of 15 days in
such cases; and to
request the Dy Comr to
report why the forfeiture
was declared prematurely.

By order

for Secretary

11/1/96

LR 96-97-5



From The Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
General and Rev Dept

Dated 1st February 1898

Despatched

Received

General No. 335
No. 732

Enclosure No. 1 & Records.

Nothing
My 10/2/98

Posted 28th March 98

With reference to his No. 6839/860 dt 15th January 1898 regarding petition of Ramaiah alias Sahukara, forwards copy of Supt Salt Revenue officers report dt 26th ultimo explaining the points noted therein

Rev Asst M
5/2/98

Rec'd 7/2
Reps herewith.
AK
8/2/98

9/2/98 Mly

No. 485
Dated 19th March

Deputy Commissioner's office
Shirdi Sub-District
Camp Chinmajiri, the 7th March 1928.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Bombay
General and Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 339 of 1928 dated 15th January 1928 returning the records connected with the petition of Kondaji alias Sakharam of Brahmani Taluka Vaijapur village in the Nasik District regarding the sale of a portion of Survey No. 29 for arrears of Revenue and requesting a report regarding the alleged declaration of forfeiture of the holding within an interval of 10 days from the date of service of the notice of demand, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of docket No. 224 dated 21st ultimo from the Sub-Divisional officer, Sinnar, explaining the point alluded to in the above.

2. The records received with the

docket number set by court hereto
respectfully submitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

H. Macfarlane

Asst Deputy Commissioner

Shimpa District

From The Senior Assistant Commissioner
Sagar Sub Division
To The Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga
Dated 26th January 1898.
Council No 224.

Enclosure Ten Papers.

Sir

In my No 237 dated 5th instant giving
Court to Secretary's No 6359 of the 5th idem,
Pet 360
forwarding papers connected with the petition
of Kanakya alias Subaya of Bachman-
thoane village, Nagar Taluk regarding
the sale of a portion of Survey No 20 of
Nania village for arrears of land Revenue.

In reply have the honor to state that
the actual defaulter was Nagappa
and the demand notes appear to have
been served upon him on the 26th June 1896
between which and the 17th July there was
thus an interval of more than 15 days.
Mahabalaya is the khatedar and has
expressed desire only the portion of the holding

declared to belong to A. Harper Jr. and to have been sold under exhibits marked A, B & C in the accompanying Commission Proceedings.

Sd/ A. Lamar Harper
Senior Asst. Commissioner
Sugar Labels.

"Copy"

A. Macdonald

Dy. Deputy Commissioner

Shimonoseki

1/7/21

L 96 · 9 · 6

1898

No. 558

Name of Petitioner Mangappa

Village Karur

Taluk Nagara

District Shimoga

Date of Arst 2 · 9 · 98

Date of Receipt 5 · 9 · 98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

Now with the file.

The case was dismissed for default in the 5th inst.

L.C.
7/9/98

Sub to 2nd Committee

This appellant was convicted by the Sessions Judge of Shimoga

Hy 7/9/98

The pet[r] excuses himself from attending. The original reasons seems to be good

Sub to 2nd Committee

Hy 8/9/98

K2 7/9
5-9-98

The abovementioned seems a fair case where a fair case this exemption not is necessarily allowed but that the question of the genuineness of the reasons urged

9.9.98 7802

Hy 10/9/98

To 1st Committee
Hy 10/9/98

ABSTRACT

Rev: Case no: 83 posted for hearing on 5-9-98.

The petitioner states that he was arrested & appeared before Court on 5-9-98 as he was given to understand that passengers will be detained on the way by Revenue authorities daily for inspecting them.

Prays that order may be passed, confirming the sale on a perusal of the circumstances set forth in the appeal petition

Hy 2/9/98

COURT FEE ... EIGHT ANNAS ...

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. No. [illegible]
DATE [illegible]

one anna stamp affixed

[illegible]

[illegible]

X X

[illegible] 15-9-98

[illegible] 1898 [illegible]

[illegible]

MYSORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 1581
DATE 2-5-97

1581

MYSORE ... PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. N ... 1582
DATE 25-8-...

[illegible]

[illegible]

(10) Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

+ LR 96-97-7

Appellant	Respts.
Konappa alias Subraya deceased, by Manjappa	1. Mahabala 2. Nagappa deceased by Timmappa 3. Manjia Hedga

Read:—

Petition of appeal No. 498/as 23 of 97-98, presented by Konappa of Brahmana tarane village, Nagar Taluk, against the order of the Dy. Commr. Shimoga Dist. cancelling the sale of one half of Bagayat S. No. 20 of Hanna village, Nagar taluk, for arrears of revenue.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No. 835/732 31-2-98 from the Dy. Commr. Shimoga Dist.

3. Records of the case.

The 1st Respt. Mahabala is the ~~Kadedar~~ of S. No. 20, one half of which was in the enjoyment of the 2nd Respt. during Nagappa. The Kandayam due ~~by the latter~~ on the land having fallen into arrears to the extent of Rs 25-7-7, a notice of demand was served on both Mahabala & ~~the 1st~~ Nagappa ~~and 2nd Respts. Mahabala~~ the former stated that as he had paid

Draft for Appl.

Subd. to Council

4/4/99

10994

4/4/99

Mpi spur prent on Monday

Red 5/4/99

R2 7-84 Press copy sent 16/4/99

up his position after the
Kandayan, Nagappa's
share of the Garden ~~might~~
~~be proceeded against~~.
Nagappa's share was
accordingly sold by public
auction on 23-3-96, and
knocked down to the ~~deponent~~ Plaintiff, for
Rs 105. Before the
sale was confirmed, the
3rd Def. ~~Chanya~~ Nagappa applied first to
the Arbitrators and afterwards
to the Sub Dist Officer for
the cancellation of the sale, alleging
alleging that he was the
mortgagee of all the lands
of Nagappa; that, on 17-3-96,
he had paid Rs 44-7-3
which he understood to
be the amount in arrears,
and that he was misled
by Nagappa into the belief
that ~~no one~~ nothing was
~~were due on the land~~ against the amount of assessment
due on the land.
~~to~~ the Sub Dist Officer
~~to cause the~~ proceedings were
~~stayed by the~~ Arbitrators
by the

confirmed the sale ~~on the grounds~~ that there were no irregularities in the sale and that the ~~mortgagee~~ mortgagee should be ~~prevented~~ from ~~exercising~~ exercising his rights to the said ~~property~~ property unless ~~he~~ he paid ~~within~~ within 30 days from the date of sale. On appeal to the Privy Council reversed the ~~decree~~ decree and ordered and set aside the sale ~~on the ground~~ on the ground that ~~there~~ there was ~~not~~ not been ~~proper~~ proper ~~notice~~ notice to the ~~mortgagor~~ mortgagor ~~of the arrears~~ of the arrears and that had it not been ~~for the~~ for the misrepresentation made to him by Nagappa, he would have paid the whole arrears due on the land for the years 1895-96 and that therefore the sale could not be ~~considered to have been properly held~~ considered to have been properly held.

Hence the present appeal to Court

Orders Nos. 7071-8 & 10.4.99.
O.S. 72-98 Dt.

Under all the

1 sheet

that all VV

was handed
to the first respondent
on the 3rd Sept. to Kalappah
that the mortgage, should
bear no notice of the
former amount of
arrears due, and
that had he

circumstances, Govt
see no reason to
interfere with the Deputy
Commr's order which is hereby confirmed. The appeal rejected

Draft

Dy. Secretary
6/4/99

6.4.99

To The Deputy Commr
Sivasagar
with records

Deputy Commrs petition
with

x ಪತ್ರ-ಕ್ಕೆ-ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿ
10-4-99

Proceedings of he Government of Mysore, Petition, dated 10th April 1899.

Appellant.	Respondents.
Konappa *alias* Subraya, deceased, by Manjappa.	1 Mahabalia. 2 Nagappa, deceased, by Thimmappa. 3 Manjia Udupa.

READ—

Petition of appeal No. 493—O. S. 23 of 97-98, presented by Konappa of Brahmanatarave village, Nagar taluk, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga district, cancelling the sale of one-half of bagayat S. No. 20 of Hania village, Nagar taluk, for arrears of revenue.

(2). Correspondence ending with letter No. 885—732, dated 1st February 1898, from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga district.

(3). Records of the case.

The 1st respondent Mahabalia is the khatedar of S. No. 20, one half of which was in the enjoyment of the deceased, 2nd respondent Nagappa. The kandayam due on the land having fallen into arrears to the extent of Rs. 25-7-7, a notice of demand was served on both Mahabalia and Nagappa. The former stated that as he had paid up his portion of the kandayam, the balance may be recovered from Nagappa's share of the garden. Nagappa's share was accordingly sold by public auction on 28th August 1896 and knocked down to the deceased appellant Konappa for Rs. 105. Before the sale was confirmed, the 3rd respondent, Manjia Udupa, applied first to the Amildar and afterwards to the Sub-Division Officer for the cancellation of the sale. He urged that he was the mortgagee of all the lands of Nagappa; that on 19th August 1896 he had paid Rs. 44-9-3 which he understood to be the amount in arrear, and that he was misled by Nagappa into the belief that nothing more were due on account of the arrears of assessment.

2. The Sub-Division Officer confirmed the sale observing that there were no irregularities in the sale and that the mortgagee's objection to the sale should have been preferred within 30 days from the date of sale. On appeal to the Deputy Commissioner, that Officer reversed the Sub-Division Officer's order and set aside the sale remarking that it was tainted with fraud and collusion on the part of Nagappa; that the mortgagee, 3rd respondent, had no notice of the proper amount of arrears due; that, but for the misrepresentation made to him by Nagappa, he would have paid the whole arrears due on the land for the year 1895-96; and that therefore the sale could not be upheld. Hence the present appeal to Government.

No. 7071-8—PET. F. 72-98, DATED BANGALORE, 10TH APRIL 1899.

ORDER THEREON.—Under all the circumstances, Government see no good reason to interfere with the Deputy Commissioner's order which is hereby affirmed and this appeal rejected.

C. SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, with records.

The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts.

Exd.—H.A.R.

1898-99

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 10th April 1899

No. 7071-8
Pt. F. 72-98

Rejecting the appeal of Konappa of Brahmanatarave village, Nagar taluk, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner cancelling the sale to him, for arrears of revenue, of one half of bagayat S. No. 20 of Hania village, Nagar taluk.

SBP—25-4-99—200

LR 96-97-8

Draft-

ఉపకార వేతనాలకై - విద్యార్థినీ
శ్రీమతి (1) తల్లిదండ్రులకు - (2) దాఖలు
చేసి - ఉపకార వేతనం మంజూరు చేసినట్లు తెలియ
చేయడమైనది - (3) విజయ కుమారి
దేవీ ప్రసాద్ - ఉపకార వేతనం
మంజూరు చేయడమైనది.

M. Seenaiah

Dt- 6.4.99.

ఆ మేరకు ఉపకార వేతనాలు మంజూరు
చేయవలసిందిగా ప్రార్థించడమైనది.

ఇట్లు
విద్యార్థినీ తల్లిదండ్రులు

(1) [illegible]
తల్లిదండ్రులకు

2) [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Refer
29.5.99

AK 96-97-9

(1) - 72 of 98

1899

No. 1827

Name of Petitioner Ranjappa

Village Brahmana Tarure

Taluk Nagar

District Shimoga

Date of Arzi 5-5-99

Date of Receipt 20-5-99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure three

1050 of 98 letter no 735 / 732 3-2-98 from D.C.

(2) 72 of 98 relating to the Petr is put up

AK
29.5.99

Filed

(1) Twelve Rs Stamp affixed - Stamp Duffle

(2) Is an application for review of Govt order (Endt. No 498 dy 6.4.99 rejecting petrs appeal

R.W
30/5/99 Petrs claims seem to be absolutely baseless and no material matter relied on by petr appears to be called for.

Subt to 2nd Consideration

BL
31.5.99

R.W. 30/5
31.5.99

I

I perused the Petition and the Records. This need not be referred to Govt. Say simply that the order already passed are quashed and petition rejected with interest.

Ward
1.6.99

This petn is addressed to H.H. The Maharajah Regent.

ABSTRACT

This is an appeal against the Govt order No 498-98-6-4 on the following grounds:—

1. That the land was brought by his brother in irregular Govt sale held for arrears of revenue.

part of S. No 25 of Ramja village.

2. That he has spent till now Rs 243-0-0 on it being its sale price + its interest + the cost of cultivation + Kandayam for 1500-97.

3. That the D. Commr wrote giving notice to the petr, cancelled the sale which was confirmed by the Sub-D. on the evidence of Ranjaiah alone.

. that the Govt has done nothing about giving him the costs, he has actually incurred. Prays that either the sale of the land may be confirmed or the loss viz Rs 263-4-4 incurred by him on account of the above land may be made good to him, or that he may be permitted to file a suit in the Civil Court about this.

Enc 1. Govt order No 488 dt 6-4-98.

2. Dy. Commrs order No 1871 dt 5-5-97.

3. Sub-Divl Officer's order No 886 dt 7-2-97.

MYSORE DEWAN'S SECRETARIAT
PETITION DEPARTMENT
DATE

[illegible]

[illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4-0-0

[illegible] 18-0-0

24[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(12) [illegible] 6-6-99

[illegible] 1899 [illegible]

[illegible] 16 [illegible] 97-10

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 6.5.99 [illegible]

1897 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1899 [illegible]

By order

[illegible] 5.6.99
for Secretary